

MR. N. JOHN JOSEPH (*Nominated*): ഈ സബ്ഡിവിഷനിൽ മുന്നിട്ടിരിക്കുന്ന കൃത്യാനിരൂപമാത്രമേ ഉദ്യോഗം ലഭിക്കുവാൻ മാത്രമുള്ള എന്നു ഗവണ്മെൻറു മനസ്സിലാക്കിയിട്ടുണ്ടോ?

RAO SAHIB DR. N. KUNJAN PILLAI (*Ag. Chief Secretary to Government*): അതിനെപ്പറ്റി ഇപ്പോൾ അഭിപ്രായം പറയുവാൻ നിവൃത്തിയില്ല. ഇവിടെ കൃത്യാനിരൂപമെന്തെങ്കിലും സബ്ഡിവിഷനെപ്പറ്റി മാത്രമേ ചോദിച്ചിട്ടുള്ളൂ. അതിനാണ് ഉത്തരം പറഞ്ഞത്.

MR. N. JOHN JOSEPH (*Nominated*): അധികൃതകൃത്യാനിരൂപം ശരിയായ പ്രാതിനിയം കിട്ടത്തക്കവണ്ണം അവരെ പ്രത്യേകം വിഭാഗമായി തിരിക്കാമോ?

RAO SAHIB DR. N. KUNJAN PILLAI (*Ag. Chief Secretary to Government*): അവരെ പ്രത്യേകം വിഭാഗമായി തിരിച്ചിട്ടുണ്ട്. അതുകൊണ്ട് അവരുടെ സങ്കടം തീരുമെന്നാണ് വിചാരിക്കുന്നത്.

MR. G. NILAKANTAN (*Nominated*): May I know whether the various denominations are given appointments according to the strength of the population?

RAO SAHIB DR. N. KUNJAN PILLAI (*Ag. Chief Secretary to Government*): It is not exactly according to the numerical strength of each community that appointments are given.

MR. K. R. ELENKATH (*Kalkulam I*): May I know whether South Travancore Christians are classified as a separate community in the matter of giving appointments?

RAO SAHIB DR. N. KUNJAN PILLAI (*Ag. Chief Secretary to Government*): No.

Damage caused by breach of bund at Arasakulam Ela.

77. * **MR. M. MAHOMED HANEEF** (*Nominated*): Will the Government be pleased to state:

(a) whether they have received petitions from the ryots of Arasakulam and Amsi in Vilavankod taluk regarding the heavy loss they have sustained by reason of a breach of bund at Arasakulam Ela during the floods; and

(b) if the answer to part (a) is in the affirmative, whether they have taken any action to redress their grievances?

MR. L. H. JACOB (*Ag. Chief Engineer*): Yes. One petition was received from the ryots of Amsikulam by the Division Officer, Nagercoil.

(b) Yes. An estimate has been submitted by the Division Officer, Nagercoil, for closing the breaches in the Amsikulam surplus *kul* and is under scrutiny by the Chief Engineer.

Development of tannery.

78. * **MR. KAINIKKARA M. PADMANABHA PILLAI** (*Chunganchery I*): Will the Government be pleased to state why the scheme for the development of tannery submitted by the Director of Industries was rejected by the Government (*vide* Administration Report of the Department of Industries for 1107, page 11)?

MR. N. K. PADMANABHA PILLAI (*Director of Industries*): Because the scheme was considered too costly.

MR. KAINIKKARA M. PADMANABHA PILLAI (*Changanachery I*): May I refer the member to the Government order in the departmental Administration Report which says that the Director of Industries should devote his special attention to the development of tannery?

DEPUTY PRESIDENT: You must put the question in a different form. You say, "may I refer," which is not a question for eliciting information.

MR. KAINIKKARA M. PADMANABHA PILLAI (*Changanachery I*): Sir, I wish to know, if the member's attention has been drawn to a statement in the departmental Administration Report which says that the Director of Industries should devote his special attention to the development of tannery in the State and suggest radical changes in the different branches of his department.

DEPUTY PRESIDENT: That does not arise, because the answer is that the scheme was considered too costly.

MR. KAINIKKARA M. PADMANABHA PILLAI (*Changanachery I*): In the Government order nothing is mentioned about the scheme to be suggested by the Director and the Government says that the Director may submit his scheme. I am unable to reconcile these two statements, Sir.

DEPUTY PRESIDENT: You cannot cross-examine the member.

MR. G. NILAKANTAN (*Nominated*): May I know why the Government which directed the Head of the Industries Department to submit a scheme refuses to sanction his scheme?

MR. N. K. PADMANABHA PILLAI (*Director of Industries*): I have suggested a modest (less expensive) scheme as desired by Government and that has been sanctioned by Government.

MR. G. NILAKANTAN (*Nominated*): May I know, could not research work in the development of tannery be scientifically carried out?

MR. N. K. PADMANABHA PILLAI (*Director of Industries*): Yes.

MR. G. NILAKANTAN (*Nominated*): May I know whether the leather manufactured here is approved by the local merchants?

MR. N. K. PADMANABHA PILLAI (*Director of Industries*): Most of the leather manufactured is being utilised by the Stationery Department.

MR. E. V. KRISHNA PILLAI (*Pattanamittita*): May I know how much amount is involved in the scheme suggested by the Director? An approximate amount will suffice?

MR. N. K. PADMANABHA PILLAI (*Director of Industries*): About Rs. 17,000.

MR. E. V. KRISHNA PILLAI (*Pattanamittita*): Will the Government be profited by this?

MR. N. K. PADMANABHA PILLAI (*Director of Industries*): They might derive some profit, as this is a semi-educational concern.

MR. E. V. KRISHNA PILLAI (*Pattanamittita*): In this amount of Rs. 17,000, how much amount goes to the development of factories?

MR. N. K. PADMANABHA PILLAI (*Director of Industries*): I claim notice.

MR. E. V. KRISHNA PILLAI (*Pattanamtitta*): When the Director submitted this scheme which involves Rs. 17,000 to Government, were hopes held out by the Director in regard to the improvement of tannery in the State?

MR. N. K. PADMANABHA PILLAI (*Director of Industries*): Yes; by the introduction of some machinery for the manufacture of a better class leather.

MR. E. V. KRISHNA PILLAI (*Pattanamtitta*): Did the Director think that he is justified in asking Government for an investment of Rs. 17,000 in view of the extent of utility that will be derived from the scheme now suggested and was it on the clear statement of all these facts that the Government rejected his scheme?

MR. N. K. PADMANABHA PILLAI (*Director of Industries*): The scheme was considered too costly.

MR. V. RAMAKRISHNA PANICKAR (*Kartikapalli II*): May I know whether the scheme was tried?

MR. N. K. PADMANABHA PILLAI (*Director of Industries*): It is being tried.

MR. V. RAMAKRISHNA PANICKAR (*Kartikapalli II*): Then may I know, how did Government come to the conclusion that the scheme was costly?

MR. N. K. PADMANABHA PILLAI (*Director of Industries*): The scheme was suggested in 1107 when there was economic depression.

T. B. at Changanachery.

79. *MR. KAINIKKARA M. PADMANABHA PILLAI (*Changanachery I*): Will the Government be pleased to state:

- (a) when the Changanachery T. B. was pulled down;
- (b) why it was pulled down;
- (c) whether it was because T. B. was unfit for use or because a T. B. is not necessary at Changanachery; and
- (d) if the first, then, why a new T. B. has not been put up, not even begun?

MR. L. H. JACOB (*Ag. Chief Engineer*): (a) Karkatakam 1107.

(b) and (c) It was disposed of as it was unfit for use due to its dilapidated condition and its insanitary surroundings.

(d) Sanction has been accorded by Government to construct new T. B., for which a fresh site has been acquired and an estimate for the building is under preparation.

MR. KAINIKKARA M. PADMANABHA PILLAI (*Changanachery I*): May I know, when was the sanction made for a new building?

MR. L. H. JACOB (*Ag. Chief Engineer*): About the time when the old building was dismantled.

MR. KAINIKKARA M. PADMANABHA PILLAI (*Changanachery I*): Was any amount allotted during the year?

MR. L. H. JACOB (*Ag. Chief Engineer*): Yes.

MR. KAINIKKARA M. PADMANABHA PILLAI (*Changanachery I*): Is there any building now owned by Government or rented which is being used as a T. B.?